

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 61-67 are pending in the present application, Claims 61-67 are added and Claims 1-60 are cancelled by the present amendment.

Support for additions to the claims can be found, at least, in paragraphs [0117] to [0120].

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 31, 33, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Böhnke (U.S. Pat. No. 6,546,107); and Claims 4 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Böhnke.

Initially, applicant and applicant's representative wish to thank Examiner Ngo for the interview granted applicant's representative on December 6, 2006. During that interview the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during that interview new claim language was discussed to address the outstanding rejection and to clarify the claims. The present response sets forth the discussed claim language. During the interview applicant's representative also pointed out distinctions between the claims and the applied art. During the interview the Examiner indicated he would further consider such claims and differences when formally presented in a filed response.

In view of the cancellation of Claims 1-60, the above-noted rejections are rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

New Claim 61 recites, in part,

an electronic apparatus generating heat and a magnetic field;
a housing having a surface and an inside where the electronic apparatus is provided, the housing made of a metal material, wherein an induced current is generated on the surface of the housing by the magnetic field and has a concentration part that is a center position of the magnetic field,

wherein the housing includes a plurality of space forming parts, the space forming parts being formed radially from the concentration

part and being placed in a position that limits any disturbance of the induced current, and
a longitudinal direction of each of the space forming parts is along the direction of the induced current.

Turning now to the Böhnke reference cited in the outstanding Action, Applicants respectfully submit that Amended Claim 61 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Böhnke.

Böhnke describes a magnetic cover that is placed on a telephone receiver. Further Böhnke describes that the magnetic cover shields static magnetic fields while allowing dynamic magnetic fields to radiate through the cover untouched. Additionally, the magnetic cover includes a number of slits, arranged radially from the center of the cover¹ and designed to allow sound to easily pass through the cover² and reduce eddy currents on the cover.³

However, Böhnke makes no mention of a concentration part of the induced current. Further, Böhnke does not describe that the plurality of space forming parts are formed radially *from the concentration part*.

Additionally, even if the Böhnke reference is interpreted to have a concentration part in the center of the cover (which it is not evidence that this is the case), Böhnke in no way describes that the space forming parts are placed in a position that limits disturbance of the induced current. Instead in Böhnke, the currents formed on the surface of the cover are *reduced* by the slits.⁴ In contrast, in the claimed invention, the induced current is purposely *not disturbed* to increase the shielding effect for all types of radiation, while in Böhnke these currents are purposely reduced.

Further, in Böhnke describes that the cover shield is made of a magnetic material while the housing recited in Claim 61 is made of a metal material.

¹ Böhnke, col. 5, lines 2-3.

² Böhnke, Abstract.

³ Böhnke, col. 5, lines 3-10.

⁴ Böhnke, col. 5, lines 3-7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 61 patentably distinguishes over the cited Böhnke reference.

Applicants further submit that Claim 62 also patentably distinguishes over the cited Böhnke reference.

Claim 62 recites, in part,

wherein the concentration part is generated on a portion of the surface of the housing structure at a center of the space forming parts such that no space forming part extends into the concentration part.

Support for this newly added feature can be found, at least, in Figures 1 and 2.

As can be seen in Figure 4 of Böhnke, the center portion of the cover includes a long slit SZ'. As discussed above, if the center portion of the cover of Böhnke is interpreted to be the concentration part of a surface current (which there is no evidence that it is) the cover of Böhnke would still be very different from the invention recited in Claim 62. Claim 62 recites that the concentration part is generated on a portion of the surface of the housing structure at a center of the space forming parts such that no space forming part extends into the concentration part.

In other words, the space forming parts are not formed in the housing in the location of the concentration part. This feature is much different from the cover of Böhnke that shows a slit through the center of the cover SZ'.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit for all the reasons noted above, Claim 62 even further patentably distinguishes over the cited Böhnke reference.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-60 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423